

Classification of nonproduct states with maximum stabilizer dimension

David W. Lyons,^{*} Scott N. Walck,[†] and Stephanie A. Blanda[‡]
Lebanon Valley College, Annville, PA 17003
 (Dated: 11 September 2007)

Nonproduct n -qubit pure states with maximum dimensional stabilizer subgroups of the group of local unitary transformations are precisely the generalized n -qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states and their local unitary equivalents, for $n \geq 3, n \neq 4$. We characterize the Lie algebra of the stabilizer subgroup for these states. For $n = 4$, there is an additional maximal stabilizer subalgebra, not local unitary equivalent to the former. We give a canonical form for states with this stabilizer as well.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

The desire to measure and classify entanglement for multiparty states of n -qubit systems has been motivated by potential applications in quantum computation and communication that utilize entanglement as a resource [1, 2]. Entanglement classification is also an interesting question in the fundamental theory of quantum information.

It is natural to consider two states to have the same entanglement type if one is transformable to the other by a local unitary transformation [3, 4]. Thus any entanglement measure, as a function on state space, must be invariant under the action of the local unitary group. One such invariant is the isomorphism class of the stabilizer subgroup (the set of local unitary transformations that do not alter a given state) and its Lie algebra of infinitesimal transformations. Inspired by ideas originally laid out for 3-qubit systems [3, 5], the authors of the present paper have achieved a number of results for systems of arbitrary numbers of qubits on the structure of stabilizer Lie subalgebras and in particular, those stabilizers that have maximum possible dimension. Evidence that maximum stabilizer dimension is an interesting property is the fact that states that have such stabilizers also turn out to maximize other known entanglement measures and play key roles in quantum computational algorithms [6, 7]. In [8] we describe a connection between stabilizer structure and the question of when a pure state is determined by its reduced density matrices.

States with maximum stabilizer dimension are products of singlet pairs (with an unentangled qubit when the number of qubits is odd) and their local unitary equivalents [9, 10]. In the present paper, we show an analogous result for *nonproduct* states with maximum stabilizer dimension. These are the generalized n -qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states

$$\alpha |00 \cdots 0\rangle + \beta |11 \cdots 1\rangle, \quad \alpha, \beta \neq 0$$

and their local unitary equivalents for 3 or more qubits, together with an additional class of states for the special case of 4 qubits. In order to prove these results, we extend the stabilizer analysis of our previous work [11] from stabilizers of pure states to stabilizers of arbitrary density matrices.

II. THE MAIN RESULT

The n -qubit local unitary group is

$$G = G_0 \times G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$$

where $G_0 = U(1)$ is the group of phases and $G_j = SU(2)$ is the 3-dimensional group of single qubit rotations in qubit j for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Its Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n$$

is the set of infinitesimal local unitary transformations acting on the tangent level, where $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is 1-dimensional and each $\mathfrak{g}_j = \mathfrak{su}(2)$, the set of skew-Hermitian matrices with trace zero. Given an n -qubit state vector $|\psi\rangle$, let

$$\text{Stab}_\psi = \{g \in G : g|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\}$$

denote the subgroup of elements in G that stabilize ψ , and let

$$K_\psi = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} : X|\psi\rangle = 0\}$$

be the corresponding Lie algebra.

In [11] we show that the maximum possible dimension for K_ψ is $n - 1$ when ψ is not a product state, for $n \geq 3$. Further, we show that for $n \neq 4$, we must have $\dim P_j K_\psi = 1$ for all j , where $P_j : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_j$ is the natural projection. In fact this condition holds for the generalized n -qubit GHZ state

$$\alpha |00 \cdots 0\rangle + \beta |11 \cdots 1\rangle$$

and its LU equivalents. For $n = 4$, there is an additional possible condition for K_ψ to attain maximum dimension, and that is $\dim P_j K_\psi = 3$ for all j and $K_\psi \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$. The main result of the present paper is the converse of these

^{*}Electronic address: lyons@lvc.edu

[†]Electronic address: walck@lvc.edu

[‡]Electronic address: sab002@lvc.edu

previous results. We show that the generalized n -qubit GHZ states (and LU equivalents) are the *only* nonproduct states that have maximum stabilizer dimension, except for the 4-qubit case. For those 4-qubit states with stabilizer isomorphic to $su(2)$, we give a canonical representative for each LU equivalence class. Here is the formal statement.

Theorem 1. (Classification of states with maximal stabilizer) *Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a nonproduct n -qubit state with stabilizer subalgebra K_ψ of maximum possible dimension $n-1$, for some $n \geq 3$. One of two conditions must hold:*

- (i) $\dim P_j K_\psi = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, or
- (ii) $n = 4$, $\dim P_j K_\psi = 3$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $K_\psi \cong su(2)$.

If (i) holds, then $|\psi\rangle$ is LU equivalent to a generalized n -qubit GHZ state. If (ii) holds, then $|\psi\rangle$ is LU equivalent to a state of the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle = & a(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) \\ & + b(|1001\rangle + |0110\rangle) \\ & + c(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

for some complex coefficients a, b, c satisfying $a > 0$, $abc \neq 0$ and $a + b + c = 0$. Furthermore, this is a unique representative of the LU equivalence class for $|\psi\rangle$ of this form.

The proof divides naturally into two sections, one for each of the two conditions on stabilizer in the statement of the theorem. We consider conditions (i) and (ii) in sections IV and V, respectively. It is convenient to work in terms of density matrices and their local unitary stabilizers; the following preliminary section establishes the necessary extension of our previous results to local unitary action on density matrices.

III. PRELIMINARY PROPOSITIONS ON STABILIZER STRUCTURE

For the set of n -qubit pure and mixed density matrices, we may omit the phase factor in local unitary operations, and take the local unitary group to be

$$SU(2)^n = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n \subset G$$

and its Lie algebra to be

$$su(2)^n = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n \subset \mathfrak{g}.$$

Given an n -qubit density matrix ρ , an element $g \in SU(2)^n$ acts on ρ by

$$g \cdot \rho = g \rho g^\dagger.$$

An element $X \in su(2)^n$ acts on the infinitesimal level by

$$X \cdot \rho = [X, \rho] = X\rho - \rho X.$$

Let

$$\text{Stab}_\rho = \{g \in SU(2)^n : g \rho g^\dagger = \rho\}$$

denote the subgroup of elements that stabilize ρ , and let

$$K_\rho = \{X \in su(2)^n : [X, \rho] = 0\}$$

be the corresponding Lie algebra. We use multi-index notation $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$, where each i_k is a binary digit, to denote labels for the standard computational basis for state space. We write I^c to denote the bitwise complement of I .

One expects a natural correspondence between K_ψ and K_ρ in the case where $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, and indeed there is.

Proposition 1. *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a pure n -qubit density matrix. Then $K_\rho = PK_\psi$, where $P: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n$ is the natural projection that drops the phase factor.*

Proof. We begin with a simple observation. Let $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and let $|\phi\rangle = X|\psi\rangle$. Skew-Hermiticity of X gives us

$$\langle\psi|X = -\langle\phi|. \quad (1)$$

To see that $PK_\psi \subset K_\rho$, let $X \in K_\psi$, say $X = (-it, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$. Let $Y = PX$, so $Y|\psi\rangle = it|\psi\rangle$. Then

$$[Y, \rho] = Y|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|Y = it\rho - it\rho = 0.$$

To get the second equality, apply (1) to $|\phi\rangle = it|\psi\rangle = Y|\psi\rangle$.

Conversely, we show that $K_\rho \subset PK_\psi$. Let $Y \in K_\rho$, and let $|\phi\rangle = Y|\psi\rangle$. Using (1) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [Y, \rho] = Y|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|Y \\ &= |\phi\rangle\langle\psi| + |\psi\rangle\langle\phi| = |\phi\rangle\langle\psi| + (|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|)^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

so $|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is skew-Hermitian. Thus there is some unitary U such that $U|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|U^\dagger$ is diagonal, with pure imaginary entries. In fact there is only one nonzero diagonal entry, say is for some real s , since $|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|$ has rank one. Therefore $U|\phi\rangle = isU|\psi\rangle$, so $|\phi\rangle = is|\psi\rangle$. Thus Y is the projection of $(-is, Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ in K_ψ . This concludes the proof. $\square$

Let us use the symbol P_j to denote both the projection $P_j: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_j$ and also $P_j: su(2)^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_j$. Applying P_j to both sides of $K_\rho = PK_\psi$ yields the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a pure n -qubit density matrix. Then $P_j K_\rho = P_j K_\psi$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$.*

The next proposition establishes that we may work with either K_ρ or K_ψ to calculate stabilizer dimension.

Proposition 2. *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a pure n -qubit density matrix. Then $\dim K_\rho = \dim K_\psi$.*

Proof. Let $X_1, \dots, X_r \in K_\psi$ be linearly independent. Let $Y_k = PX_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$ and suppose that

$$0 = \sum a_k Y_k$$

for some scalars a_k . Since $Y_k = X_k - it_k$ for some t_k , we have

$$\sum a_k X_k = i \sum a_k t_k.$$

Since $\sum a_k X_k$ is in K_ψ , so is $i \sum a_k t_k$, and so both of these sums must be zero. Since the X_k are independent, all the a_k must be zero, and hence the Y_k are also linearly independent. $\square$

We choose the basis

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

for $su(2)$. We denote by A_j the element in $\mathfrak{g}$ that has A in the j th qubit slot and zeros elsewhere. By slight abuse of notation, we use the same symbol for the corresponding element in $su(2)^n$. Analogous notation applies for B_j and C_j , for $1 \leq j \leq n$.

We will make repeated use of the following basic calculation. Let $X = \sum t_k A_k$ be an element of the local unitary Lie algebra $su(2)^n$. It is straightforward to check that

$$X \cdot \rho = [X, \rho] = \sum_{I,J} \zeta(I, J) \rho_{I,J} |I\rangle \langle J|, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\zeta(I, J) = i \sum_{\ell=1}^n t_\ell [(-1)^{i_\ell} + (-1)^{j_\ell+1}] = 2i \sum_{\ell: i_\ell \neq j_\ell} (-1)^{i_\ell} t_\ell.$$

As a consequence, we have the following.

Proposition 3. *Let ρ be an n -qubit density matrix, let $X = \sum t_k A_k$, and suppose that $X \in K_\rho$. Then either $\zeta(I, J) = 0$ or $\rho_{I,J} = 0$ for all I, J .*

We record here a proposition proved in [10] (Lemma 3.8) with an alternative proof using Proposition 3.

Proposition 4. (Stabilizer criterion for an unentangled qubit) *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ be a pure n -qubit density matrix where $|\psi\rangle = \sum c_I |I\rangle$. If $A_\ell \in K_\rho$, then the ℓ th qubit is unentangled.*

Proof. Choose any nonzero state coefficient $c_{I'}$. Apply Proposition 3 to $X = A_\ell$, $I = I'$ and J for which $j_\ell \neq i'_\ell$. Since $\zeta(I', J) = \pm 2i \neq 0$, we conclude that c_J must be zero. $\square$

Proposition 5. (Stabilizer criterion for generalized n -qubit GHZ states) *Let $|\psi\rangle = \sum_I c_I |I\rangle$ be a nonproduct n -qubit state vector for some $n \geq 3$, and let*

$$V = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n t_k A_k : \sum t_k = 0 \right\}.$$

We have $V = K_\psi$ if and only if ψ is a generalized n -qubit GHZ state.

Proof. In Section V of [11] we show that if ψ is a generalized n -qubit GHZ state, then $K_\psi = V$. Now we prove the converse.

Suppose that $K_\psi = V$. Choose a multi-index I such that $c_I \neq 0$. If J is another multi-index different from I in indices $\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, \dots, k_p\}$ and equal to I in some index r , let

$$X = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}} (-1)^{i_j} A_j - \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}} (-1)^{i_j} \right) A_r,$$

so that the sum of the coefficients of the A_j is zero, so X is in K_ψ . Viewing X as an element of K_ρ and applying (2), we have

$$\zeta(I, J) = 2i \sum_{\ell: i_\ell \neq j_\ell} (-1)^{i_\ell} t_\ell = 2i \sum_{j=1}^p (-1)^{2i_{k_j}} = 2ip \neq 0$$

so $\rho_{I,J} = c_I c_J^* = 0$ by Proposition 3, so $c_J = 0$. It follows that $|\psi\rangle$ has the form $|\psi\rangle = \alpha |I\rangle + \beta |I^c\rangle$ for some nonzero α, β . Finally, if I does not consist of all zeros or all ones, say $i_k = 0, i_\ell = 1$, then let $X = A_k - A_\ell$, then $\zeta(I, I^c) = 4i \neq 0$, so ρ_{I,I^c} would have to be zero, but this is impossible. Thus we conclude that $|\psi\rangle = \alpha |00 \dots 0\rangle + \beta |11 \dots 1\rangle$. $\square$

IV. MAXIMAL STABILIZERS WITH 1-DIMENSIONAL PROJECTIONS IN EACH QUBIT

In this section we consider the consequences of condition (i) in the statement of Theorem 1. By virtue of Propositions 1 and 2, we may work with K_ρ in place of K_ψ . If $\dim P_j K_\rho = 1$ for all j , we can apply an LU transformation so that $P_j X = t(X) A$ for all $X \in K_\rho$, where $t(X)$ is a scalar that depends on X . After this adjustment, the stabilizer K_ρ is a codimension 1 subspace of the subspace of $su(2)^n$ spanned by $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$. Thus there is some nonzero real vector $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$ such that

$$K_\rho = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n t_k A_k : \sum m_k t_k = 0 \right\}.$$

In the following Proposition, we show that the only way for a nonproduct state to have this stabilizer is to be (LU equivalent to) a generalized n -qubit GHZ state.

Proposition 6. *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ be a pure nonproduct n -qubit density matrix with stabilizer subalgebra*

$$K_\rho = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n t_k A_k : \sum m_k t_k = 0 \right\}$$

where $0 \neq (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then all the m_j have the same absolute value and $|\psi\rangle$ is LU equivalent to a generalized n -qubit GHZ state.

Proof. We may suppose, after a suitable LU transformation, that $c_{00\dots 0} \neq 0$ (the LU transformation $\exp(\pi/2C_j) = \text{Id} \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Id} \otimes C_j \otimes \text{Id} \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Id}$ sends $|I\rangle$ to $|I_j\rangle$, where Id is the 2×2 identity matrix and I_j denotes the multi-index obtained from I by complementing the j th index, and changes the stabilizer element $\sum t_k A_k$ to $\sum (-1)^{\delta_{jk}} t_k A_k$, where δ_{jk} denotes the Kronecker delta). This operation may change the sign of some of the m_j , but does not change their absolute values.

If any $m_\ell = 0$, then $A_\ell \in K_\rho$. By Proposition 4, it follows that the ℓ th qubit is unentangled. But $|\psi\rangle$ is not a product, so we can rule out the possibility that any m_ℓ is zero.

Suppose now that there exist two coordinates of $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ with different absolute values. Then $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ and $J = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ are linearly independent, where J is any nonzero vector whose entries are all 0's and 1's. Let J be a multi-index not equal to $00\dots 0$ with 1's in positions $k_1, \dots, k_p$. We may choose a vector $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ that is perpendicular to $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ but *not* perpendicular to J . It follows that $X = \sum t_k A_k$ lies in K_ρ , but $\sum_{\ell=1}^p t_{k_\ell} \neq 0$, so we conclude that $c_J = 0$ by Proposition 3. This means that $|\psi\rangle$ is the completely unentangled state $|00\dots 0\rangle$. But this is a contradiction, since $|\psi\rangle$ is not a product. This establishes that all the m_j have the same absolute value.

Thus $|\psi\rangle$ has (possibly after an LU transformation) the stabilizer of a generalized n -qubit GHZ state, and therefore $|\psi\rangle$ must be a generalized n -qubit GHZ state by Proposition 5. $\square$

V. THE 4-QUBIT CASE

In this section we consider condition (ii) of Theorem 1. It follows from Lemma 1 and Proposition 1 of [11] that after an LU transformation, if necessary, we may take K_ρ to be

$$K_\rho = \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^4 A_k, \sum_{k=1}^4 B_k, \sum_{k=1}^4 C_k \right\rangle.$$

From this assumption, we derive a canonical form for unique representatives of each LU equivalence class.

Proposition 7. (Classification of 4-qubit states with $su(2)$ stabilizer) *Let $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a pure 4-qubit density matrix, where $|\psi\rangle = \sum_I c_I |I\rangle$, and let*

$$V = \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^4 A_k, \sum_{k=1}^4 B_k, \sum_{k=1}^4 C_k \right\rangle.$$

Then $K_\rho = V$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= a(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) \\ &+ b(|1001\rangle + |0110\rangle) \\ &+ c(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

for some complex coefficients a, b, c satisfying $a > 0$, $abc \neq 0$ and $a + b + c = 0$. Furthermore, this is a unique representative of the LU equivalence class for $|\psi\rangle$ of this form.

Proof. Suppose that $K_\rho = V$.

First we consider the consequences of the element $\sum A_k$ in K_ρ . By Proposition 3, for each I, J for which $\rho_{I,J} = c_I c_J^* \neq 0$, we have

$$\zeta(I, J) = \sum_{\ell: i_\ell \neq j_\ell} (-1)^{i_\ell} = 0.$$

From this it follows that if $c_I, c_J \neq 0$ and we have to flip n_0 zeros and n_1 ones to transform I into J , then $n_0 = n_1$. If m is the number of indices which are zeros in both I and J , then the number of zeros in I is $n_0 + m$, and the number of zeros in J is $n_1 + m = n_0 + m$. It follows that the number of zeros is constant for all multi-indices I for which $c_I \neq 0$.

Next we consider $\sum C_k$ in K_ρ . Since $\exp(\pi/2C) = C$, we have

$$\rho = \exp(\pi/2 \sum C_k) \cdot \rho = \sum_{I,J} \rho_{I^c, J^c} |I\rangle\langle J|,$$

so

$$c_I c_J^* = c_{I^c} c_{J^c}^* \quad (3)$$

for all I, J . Applying (3) to the pair I, I , we obtain $|c_I| = |c_{I^c}|$. Applying (3) to the pair I, I^c , we see that $c_I c_{I^c}^*$ is real, so it must be that $c_I = c_{I^c}$ for all I . Since the number of zeros is constant for all multi-indices for nonzero state coefficients, it follows that this number must be two. Thus we have so far that $|\psi\rangle$ must be of the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= a(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) \\ &+ b(|1001\rangle + |0110\rangle) \\ &+ c(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

for some a, b, c . If $a = 0$, then $A_1 - A_2$ would be in K_ρ , violating our assumption. Similarly, neither b nor c can be zero.

To see that $a + b + c$ must equal zero, note that $(\sum C_k) \cdot \rho = 0$ means that $(\sum C_k) \cdot |\psi\rangle = it |\psi\rangle$ for some t . A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\left(\sum C_k \right) \cdot |\psi\rangle = i \sum_I \left(\sum_k c_{I_k} \right) |I\rangle,$$

where I_k denotes the multi-index obtained from I by complementing the k th index. The coefficient of $|1000\rangle$ on the right hand side is $(a + b + c) |1000\rangle$, but zero on the left hand side, so $a + b + c = 0$. Finally, we may take a to be positive by applying a phase adjustment, if necessary.

Conversely, suppose that ψ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= a(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) \\ &+ b(|1001\rangle + |0110\rangle) \\ &+ c(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

for some a, b, c , $abc \neq 0$ and $a + b + c = 0$. It is easy to check that K_ρ contains V . By our analysis of stabilizer structure in [11], we have $\dim K_\rho \leq 6$. We know $\dim K_\rho = 6$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ is (LU equivalent to) a product of two singlet pairs ([10]), but we can rule this out (it is easy to check that $|\psi\rangle$ is not a product). Lemma 1 in [11] rules out the possibility that $\dim K_\rho$ could be 4 or 5, so $\dim K_\rho$ must equal 3 and we must have $K_\rho = V$.

To show that $|\psi\rangle$ is the unique representative of its LU class with the form stated in the Proposition, we use local unitary invariants. First, we consider invariants of the form $\text{tr}((\text{tr}_A \rho)^2)$ where A is a subsystem consisting of a subset of the 4 qubits. From these trace invariants, a straightforward derivation produces invariants I_1, I_2, I_3 in the table below.

Qubit pair in A	Invariant
(1, 2)	$I_1(\psi) = a b $
(1, 3)	$I_2(\psi) = a c $
(1, 4)	$I_3(\psi) = b c $

It follows that the norms of the state coefficients for $|\psi\rangle$ are LU invariant (for example, we have $|a| = \sqrt{I_1(\psi)I_2(\psi)/I_3(\psi)}$). Since we are taking a to be positive, and since $a + b + c = 0$, a simple geometric or algebraic argument shows that b and c are determined up to conjugate.

To determine the imaginary parts of b and c , we use a class of invariants given by

$$P_{\sigma, \tau, \phi}^m(\psi) = \sum_{I^1, I^2, \dots, I^m} c_{I^1} \cdots c_{I^m} c_{J^1}^* \cdots c_{J^m}^*$$

where $I^1, \dots, I^m$ is an m -tuple of 4-qubit multi-indices $I^k = (i_1^k, \dots, i_4^k)$, and

$$J^k = (i_1^k, i_{\sigma(1)}^k, i_{\tau(1)}^k, i_{\phi(1)}^k)$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m$ [3, 12]. We consider the invariant for $m = 3$, $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\phi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

The imaginary part of this invariant acting on ψ is

$$-24a^2b_1b_2(b_1^2 + b_2^2 + ab_1)$$

where b_1, b_2 are the real and imaginary parts of b , respectively. From this we see that if $b_1 \neq 0$, then b_2 is

determined. If $b_1 = 0$, then b_2 is not completely determined; there remains the ambiguity of conjugation for b and c . To settle this, let $\alpha(r, s, t)$ denote the state

$$\begin{aligned} & r(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle) \\ & + s(|1001\rangle + |0110\rangle) \\ & + t(|1010\rangle + |0101\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

for state coefficients r, s, t . The (not local unitary) operation that permutes qubits 3 and 4 takes $\alpha(a, b, c)$ to $\alpha(a, c, b)$. If b is pure imaginary, then c is not, so our invariant $P_{\sigma, \tau, \phi}^3$ tells us that $\alpha(a, c, b)$ is *not* LU equivalent to $\alpha(a, c^*, b^*)$. It follows that $\alpha(a, b, c)$ is *not* LU equivalent to $\alpha(a, b^*, c^*)$, for if the LU operation $g_1 \otimes g_2 \otimes g_3 \otimes g_4$ takes $\alpha(a, b, c)$ to $\alpha(a, b^*, c^*)$, then the LU operation $g_1 \otimes g_2 \otimes g_4 \otimes g_3$ takes $\alpha(a, c, b)$ to the LU inequivalent state $\alpha(a, c^*, b^*)$.

Having exhausted all cases, we see that $|\psi\rangle$ is the unique state in its LU equivalence class of the form stated in the Proposition. $\square$

VI. CONCLUSION

We have described the stabilizer subalgebra structure and have a complete description of states with stabilizers of maximum dimension, both for product and nonproduct states. We have shown evidence that warrants further study of stabilizer structure. There are at least three natural directions in which to further pursue this analysis: seek complete descriptions, perhaps a classification, of all possible stabilizer subalgebras; seek complete description and perhaps canonical LU forms in the spirit of Proposition 7 for states that have those stabilizers; and extend these pursuits to mixed states.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the National Science Foundation for their support of this work through NSF Award No. PHY-0555506.

-
- [1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, (2000).
 - [2] S. Gudder, Amer. Math. Monthly **110**, 181 (2003).
 - [3] N. Linden and S. Popescu, Fortschr. Phys. **46**, 567 (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9711016.
 - [4] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and A. Sudbery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 243 (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9801076.
 - [5] H. Carteret and A. Sudbery, J. Phys. A **33**, 4981 (2000), arXiv:quant-ph/0001091.
 - [6] A. Higuchi and A. Sudbery, Phys. Lett. A **273**, 213 (2000), arXiv:quant-ph/0005013v2.
 - [7] S. Brierley and A. Higuchi, J. Phys. A **40**, 8455 (2007), arXiv:0704.2961v1 [quant-ph].
 - [8] S. Walck and D. Lyons, arXiv:0707.4428v1 [quant-ph].
 - [9] D. W. Lyons and S. N. Walck, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 102106 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0503052.
 - [10] D. W. Lyons and S. N. Walck, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 2443 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0506241.

- [11] S. Walck and D. Lyons, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022303 (2007),
arXiv:0706.1785v2 [quant-ph].
- [12] R. Gingrich, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052302 (2002).